

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \* \* \*

KEVIN LYNN FERNANDEZ,	)	3:06-cv-00628-LRH-RAM
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	<u>ORDER</u>
STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,	)	
Defendants.	)	

---

Before the court are the following:

1. Plaintiff's Motion for Review and Objections to Magistrate's Decision Order (#153) (#158<sup>1</sup>), Defendants' Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Review and Objections to Magistrate's Decision Order (#173), and Reply (#193).

The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.

The Magistrate Judge's Order (#153) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion (#158) is denied.

2. Plaintiff's Motion for Review and Objections to Magistrate's Order (#178) (#194). Defendants responded (#214).

The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes

---

<sup>1</sup>Refers to this court's docket number.

1 that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.

2 The Magistrate Judge's Order (#178) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion  
3 (#194) is denied.

4 3. Plaintiff's Motion for Review and Objections to Magistrate's Order Docket #231  
5 (#243) and Defendants' Response (#253).

6 The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's  
7 motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes  
8 that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.

9 The Magistrate Judge's Order (#231) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion  
10 (#243) is denied.

11 4. Plaintiff's Motion for Stay of Order #231 (#244) and Defendants' Response  
12 (#252).

13 The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's  
14 motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1) and denies  
15 Plaintiff's motion (#244) based upon the immediately preceding ruling on Plaintiff's motion  
16 (#243), which overruled the objection to the ordered deposition, and also upon the grounds of its  
17 being moot in light of the deposition having been previously conducted.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DATED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2009.



20  
21  
22 LARRY R. HICKS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28